AF
IFW

AMENDMENT TRANSMITTAL LETTER

	Docket No. 0112634.00120US1

Application No. 09/923704	Filing Date August 7, 2001	Examiner P. E. Elisca	Art Unit 3621

Applicant(s): Peter MALCOLM et al.

Invention: INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

Transmitted herewith is an amendment in the above-identified application.

The fee has been calculated and is transmitted as shown below.

CLAIMS AS AMENDED					
	Claims Remaining After Amendment	Highest Number Previously Paid	Number Extra Claims Present	Rate	
Total Claims		- 20 =		x	
Independent Claims		- 3 =		x	
Multiple Dependent Claims (check if applicable) ☐					
Other fee (please specify):					
TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEE FOR THIS AMENDMENT:				0.00	

☐ Large Entity   ☒ Small Entity

☒ No additional fee is required for this amendment.

☐ Please charge Deposit Account No. _____ in the amount of $ _____ .
A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

☐ A check in the amount of $ _____ to cover the filing fee is enclosed.

☐ Payment by credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.

☒ The Director is hereby authorized to charge and credit Deposit Account No. ___08-0219___
as described below. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

  ☒ Credit any overpayment.

  ☒ Charge any additional filing or application processing fees required under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17.

Rajesh Vallabh   Dated: ___August 5, 2005___

Rajesh Vallabh
Attorney Reg. No.:   35,761

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP
60 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
(617) 526-6000

In re Application of:	Malcolm	)	Examiner:	Elisca, Pierre E.
		)		
Serial No.	09/923,704	)	Group Art Unit: 3621	
		)		
Filing Date:	August 7, 2001	)		
		)		
For:	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM			

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION

In the final office action dated June 23, 2005, the Examiner rejected each of pending claims 1-46, 114-157, 178-261, 304-353, 377-418, 438-460, and 476-585 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,835,726 issued to Shwed et al. ("Shwed").

In a telephone interview conducted on August 1, 2005, the Examiner and the undersigned discussed the rejections set forth in the final office action and the cited Shwed reference. No agreement was reached on the substance of the rejections. It was agreed, however, that the office action did not address all of the claims in the application. The Examiner agreed to reconsider the rejections and issue a further office action addressing all of the claims in the application if Applicant filed a response to the final office action identifying the claims that were not addressed in the office action, and the claim limitations that are not shown in the cited Shwed reference. Additionally, the Examiner agreed to reconsider the rejections of the claims addressed in the office action.

Accordingly, this response identifies the claims not addressed in the office action and the claim elements not disclosed by the Shwed reference. Additionally, this response further explains why the rejections of the claims addressed in the office action should be withdrawn.

I. Independent claims 1, 24 and 438 and their respective dependent claims

Independent claim 1 of the present application is directed to an information management system that includes a plurality of workstations adapted for connection to a computer network, and a data repository arranged to receive data from each of said workstations. The system includes policy data containing rules defining relevant commercial data which is to be stored in said data repository. The system also includes an analyser for monitoring at least one of said outbound data and said inbound data, to identify in at least one of said outbound data and said inbound data, relevant commercial data that is to be stored in said data repository in accordance with said rules in said policy data, and to cause said relevant commercial data to be stored in said data repository.

The system thereby identifies and stores relevant commercial data from inbound and/or outbound data transmitted or received by said workstations. Non-limiting examples of such commercial data can include passwords/usernames, digital certificates, URLs, web pages, transaction amounts, goods and services, transaction dates, and so on.

Shwed, on the other hand, discloses a packet filter for controlling information flow on a network to improve security. As explained, e.g., in the abstract of the reference, an incoming packet is judged against a filter language instruction and actions are taken accordingly. A packet may be rejected or accepted, or logged. If a packet is accepted it may be modified by encryption, decryption, signature generation, signature verification or address translation. Shwed is thereby only concerned with security; Shwed does not analyze inbound or outbound data from or to a workstation to identify any relevant commercial data or store identified relevant commercial data in a data repository.

The incoming packets of Shwed that are trapped and processed are not themselves relevant commercial data. Even if one were to consider Shwed's packets to be relevant commercial data, for the sake of argument, the elements of claim 1 would still not be met by the